SUBJECTS.

Member said that it would be a great help to the people of these localities if the Additional Munsiff's Court at Thiruvella were removed to Changanacheri with jurisdiction over these *pakuthies* as well as over the northern *pakuthies* of the Thiruvella taluk.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

Establishment of a Munsiff's Court at Ambalapuzha.

Mr. S. Parameswara Menon (Member, Ambalapuzha taluk) spoke on the necessity for a Munsiff's Court at Ambalapuzha. The two Munsiffs' Courts in the taluk were at Alleppey, in the northern-most portion of the taluk, the distance from the southern and eastern parts of the taluk being 17 and 18 miles, respectively. He suggested that, if the Additional Court at Alleppey be removed to Ambalapuzha, the people of six villages would be greatly benefited.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

Establishment of a Munsiff's Court at Nedumangad.

Mr. Sankaran Krishnan (Member, Nedumangad taluk) said that in 1052 there was a Court at Pirappancode, but when the people prayed for a new Court at Nedumangad, matters turned from bad to worse, in that the jurisdiction of the taluk was divided between the Chirayinkil and the Neyattinkara Munsiffs' Courts. It was indeed a pity that at present the people from Karakulam, a place only 4 miles from Trivandrum, had to go to Attingal through Trivandrum to conduct their cases, and the Member requested that at least the *pakuthies* of Nedumangad, Karakulam and Anad should be transferred to the Trivandrum Munsiff's Court. The Member further pointed out that the other three taluks of the Division had two Courts each and that the Nedumangad people had to go about all over the District to conduct their cases. People from Ponmudi had to travel 36 miles to conduct their cases, whether it was at Trivandrum, Neyattinkara or Chirayinkil. In these circumstances, the Member prayed that either a Munsiff's Court be established at Nedumangad or that the local Magistrate be invested with Munsiff's powers.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

(4). Registration.

35. Certain financial clauses in the new Registration Rules may be kindly reconsidered for relaxing the enhanced pressure on the middle and poorer classes of the population.

Mr. K. K. Kuruvila (Member, Nominated) represented that nine additional impositions had been brought about by the new Registration Rules, that two of these only would be referred to, and that one of them should be modified as poor people were suffering under it. The Member said that the particularisation of matters, two or more of which in an instrument would have to be treated as

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

different transactions, was necessary, as otherwise the rules were liable to be misinterpreted. Another change proposed was that the old rules for levying Rs. 2 up to Rs. 500 be continued and that Rs. 3 might be levied from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,000.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

The old practice of presenting copies of documents along with the originals for registration should be restored, as the present system was likely to give rise to mal-practices.

Mr. Krishnan Mathevan (Member, Karunagapalli taluk) urged the restoration of the old practice of presenting copies of documents with the originals for registration on the following grounds:—

(1) the copying of documents by the gumastas was likely to be done fraudulently to the detriment of the parties concerned;

(2) there was no necessity for adopting the British system here, as the conditions of the British and the Travancore land-owners widely differed;

(3) the office work had been considerably increased and only few documents could be taken for registration and returned on the same day;

(4) there was no record in the Government custody, containing the signature of the parties.

The Member then referred to the irresponsibility of the copyists (document-writers) and suggested that only qualified men should be allowed to write out documents and that a Circular should be issued to the effect that corrections in the documents should be avoided as far as possible and that documents containing corrections in regard to the amount, time, &c. should not be accepted.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

Certain hardships caused to the people by the Registration Department and measures for remedying the same.

Mr. Devan Govindan (Member, Quilon taluk) said that the new Registration Rules caused much hardship to the poor people, as the majority of the documents registered were below Rs. 350, and that there was no necessity for increasing the fees as far as the Department was concerned, in that the Department showed a steady increase of revenue from 1080 to 1086.

The Member then pointed out the lack of courtesy and the high-handed way of dealing with things on the part of certain young graduate Sub-Registrars. He also referred to the document-writers and said that they were a greedy set and caused much trouble and loss to the poor, ignorant people who went on business to the offices. The Member prayed for the following remedies:—

(1) that the registration fees might be modified in such a way as to lessen the pressure on the poor people;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly